

E671
S557

things. They uniformly opposed every measure for the security of loyal people, white or black, and when sagacious men among them have appealed to the party to acknowledge accomplished facts, and take a new departure, the controlling sentiment of the party rejected such counsels. But in spite of their opposition in peace and in war, the Republican party have settled beyond question the liberty of all citizens, the equal rights of all citizens, and the strength and power of the Government to deal with all its enemies. We are now in that happy condition where we have only to deal with the minor topics of peaceful times.

Now, I ask you, fellow citizens, is this not something to begin with? Did General Morgan give us credit for all these great results? It is very clever in him to charge us with the sins of Johnson's administration, but he might have given us some credit for the past. But I meet him on his own ground. I am willing to take the administration of General Grant, and the action of the present Congress as a part of it, and stand or fall by the judgment of the people on that. Let us take the first year of Grant's administration and compare it with the last year of Johnson's and how does the record stand?

From March 1st, 1868, to March 1st, 1869, this official statement shows that Johnson expended, \$558,131,447
From March 1st, 1869, to March 1st, 1870, Grant expended, \$293,633,794
Showing a reduction of expenditures of \$264,497,653

And this reduction has been going on ever since.

If you take from this expenditure that which grew out of the war as the interest of the debt and the pensions, the civil expenses are less in proportion to our population than during the year of Buchanan's administration.

The whole expenses, including army and navy, and extending the public debt, pension list, and other matters growing out of the war, were \$50,882,955 in currency.

Again, take the collection of revenue in the same years. The taxes and the rates of them were precisely the same; but from March 1, 1868, to March 1, 1869, the receipts were \$156,138,163, and from March 1, 1869, to March 1, 1870, the receipts were \$175,467,141, showing an increase by the honest collection of taxes of \$19,328,978, and mostly in the luxuries of whisky and tobacco. This increase is still going on, so that to the first eighteen months of Grant's administration, we are able to increase the yield of internal taxes alone, over thirty millions, without increasing a single tax.

Again—take the reduction of the public debt. In the last year of Johnson's administration, the public debt was reduced \$5,959,718. In the first year of Grant's administration it was reduced \$7,331,782—or a difference in one year of over \$1,000,000. In eighteen months of Grant's administration, without the increase of one dollar in the rate of taxation, the debt has been reduced over one hundred and sixty millions of dollars; and is now less than \$2,360,000,000, including greenbacks, fractional notes, and every form of debt.

Again—Look at the national taxes. Since the war we have gradually and cautiously reduced our internal taxes—but under Grant's administration we were able, under the present careful management of our finances, to reduce taxes by wholesale. At the last session we repealed the mass of these taxes—amounting according to an official statement I have just received to \$3,222,000 internal taxes, and \$24,000,000 tariff duties, or over \$31,000,000 in all. After this year there will be no internal taxes levied by the United States, except on whisky, tobacco, stamps and income; and the income and stamp tax is largely reduced. Now is not this doing well?

How does Gen. Morgan meet these plain and simple facts, known to him very well, and shown in these official papers? We will see after while.

But one point in passing. He assumes with a lofty indifference of parties and of Presidents that he is not responsible for President Johnson. He did not vote for him, and, as I will show, he actually charges him with an impeachable offense. But if Morgan is not responsible for Johnson, what shall we say of our friend Hubbell? He is the Democratic candidate in our district. He not only voted for Johnson, but followed him into the Democratic party, and left his old

friends of the Republican party, who had been true, and kind, and partial to him, in order to emphasize his devotion to Johnson.

But let us go back. What were the leading questions of the last session of Congress? What were the objects you wished accomplished? One was the reduction of the interest of the public debt, so as to lessen its burden; another was to give to the West its fair share of the paper money of the country; another was the reduction of taxation; another was rigid economy in public expenditures. Did Gen. Morgan enlighten you on any of these questions? Did he tell you how the Democratic party resisted the Funding bill, in order that the very weight of the debt might lead you to justly measures tending to impair the public credit? Did he ever discuss the question as to how or when the public debt should be paid? I see nothing of this in his speech, though it was one on which there was much debate and anxious consideration. So with the Currency bill. When, under the existing law, the East got a great advantage over the West and South in the organization of National Banks, the Democratic party made the greatest clamor over it. It was the chief point of Gov. Seymour's speeches in 1868, when he took the stump for himself as President. Though all this arose out of an error of construction by Secretary McCulloch and Comptroller Clark, yet when an opportunity to correct it was offered, Gen. Morgan and his political associates were found voting against the bill. So with the reduction of taxes. We were ready to, and did, as I have shown, throw off eighty-one millions of dollars of taxes. There was much debate and controversy as to what taxes should be repealed—as to how the tariff was to be altered. Here was a place where Gen. Morgan could have told you whether he was for free trade or a revenue tariff, or whether there is any difference on this question between Beatty and Hubbell. But upon this point he was as silent as an oyster. And so I am bound to say, on all these questions of practical politics now in issue, upon which the people engaged in every day pursuits naturally want and are seeking information, General Morgan did not present the questions involved in this election, but only gave you dry husks, or scattered and immaterial statements easily collected and put together as to any administration by one far less able to engage in political debate than he is.

Let us see. He tells you, but not for the first time, how good and virtuous you, the people, are or ought to be—and that you alone, of all the world have free institutions; and that the success of any party is of more importance than the success of any party. Admitted. He tells you the people demand reform, and the highest evidence of it is, that the Democratic party had nominated James R. Hubbell—a lifelong Whig and Republican. If to secure reform, they must take a Republican, why not take a good one? Well, I suppose they nominated Hubbell in the hope that he would get a few Republican votes here in Delaware.

The next great truth he tells us is that the Republican party lives only in name. It so, where does the Democratic party live? It is in the graves of Pierce and Buchanan, and a dishonored record.

Differences exist among Republicans, he says. True, and I trust independent opinion will always exist in our party. We can not be voted from a tally list like New York city. And then he tells us what the Democrats will do when restored to power. His promises are not very definite, but they are enough. Political promises are very cheap by minorities. We judge a tree by its fruits—a party by its acts.

When the devil was sick,
The devil a monk would be,
When the devil got well,
The devil a monk was he.

He then undertakes to tell us what becomes of the money of the people—and the highest and only evidence of the awful atrocity of the Republican party was the fact quoted with much detail from the report of the Auditor of Ohio, that in 1869 our State taxes amounted to the enormous sum of \$22,232,877, while in 1860 they only amounted to \$10,817,676, an increase of \$11,415,201. Is it not strange, fellow citizens, that he

forgot to tell you that in 1860 we had a Republican Legislature, and that every dollar of the \$22,232,877, collected in 1869, was voted by a Democratic Legislature in both Houses—the same Legislature that elected my colleague, Judge Thurman, to the Senate of the United States? This, certainly, is a striking illustration of what will become of the taxes paid by the people, if you are ever so unwise as to elect a Democratic Legislature again.

GRANT'S ADMINISTRATION.

And then General Morgan arraigns General Grant personally as being influenced by bribery and nepotism. Now, a good deal has been said about General Grant appointing his relatives to office, but I affirm that with two or three exceptions of minor offices attached to his person, Gen. Grant has been as free from this as any President for fifty years. I do not deem it necessary to reply to the comparison of Gen. Grant to Whittemore. No man can truly question the integrity of the President. In kingly governments the crown rewards great services by royal gifts. In a republican government the people feel at liberty to do the same. We all voted for General Grant as a just recognition for his great services, but Republicans do not consider themselves, therefore, as ineligible to hold office under him. Wealthy citizens of the East, long before Grant was a candidate for President, chose to show their appreciation of his services by a large gift freely and voluntarily bestowed. There is no instance whatever where any impartial man can say that there is the slightest evidence that these voluntary offerings of private citizens led to the appointment of any one of them.

Now the error of Gen. Grant in appointments, if he has committed any, is in regarding political experience as the ground for exclusion from office. Nearly all his chief appointments have been of a non-partisan character. He announced this as his purpose in his inaugural, he started it in the formation of his Cabinet, and he has adhered to it since. It has been usual for the President to surround himself with leading influential representatives of his party, and to call their secret counsels a *policy*, and then by executive influence and patronage to enforce that upon the people and Congress. Gen. Grant refuses to do this, whether wisely or not, but has selected his Secretaries with a view to the honest and faithful performance of their executive duties. For this reason he named such a man as A. T. Stewart, of New York, as Secretary of the Treasury, and others of like character, who certainly brought no political influence to his aid. And this effort to avoid partisan counsels has been the foundation of the base personal innuendoes and attacks that have been made upon General Grant.

Now what else does General Morgan say? He tells you that it is a notorious fact that each of General Grant's Cabinet officers and heads of bureaus keeps a carriage and horses, coachman and footman, all paid for with the people's taxes and without authority of law. Now, it is a fact that for twenty years and more, far back into Democratic times, there has been regularly attached to each of the chief executive offices, a one horse carryall, which has been used by the head of the department or bureau to carry the mail, and it needed, to expedite him over that city of magnificent distances. These have been regularly appropriated for every year by Congress, and each House of Congress has several of them. As for the coachman and footman, consider them as included in one negro messenger, who attends the door and runs errands, and you have the whole of this magnificent array. There is a great deal of humbug, fellow-citizens, in this kind of demagogism, and it is a compliment to the Republican party that my friend Morgan, in his grand opening speech, can find nothing else to arraign us for than that we have not yet corrected all the abuses of Democratic times. But I promise you I will call the attention of Dawes to this matter, and he and Morgan—one on each side—can see to it that these Cabinet officers shall walk to Cabinet councils, and not ride, except at the crown's expense.

My own opinion is that these officers are inadequately paid. Their salary was fixed long before the war; their tenure is very uncertain; they are compelled by public opinion and the people themselves to

receive a great many visitors. True economy would be consulted by giving them a salary amply sufficient to support a family in liberal style, and to hire or buy a suitable carriage and horses, without resorting to the Government carryall. General Morgan is behind the times. He underrates the intelligence of the people when he resorts to such stuff to impugn the integrity of Gov. Cox and his associates.

But he says these Cabinet officers take money from the Treasury without an appropriation by law, and that they pay without authority of law higher salaries than are provided by law. Now this is simply impossible. The Comptrollers, Auditors, and the old watch dog, Spinner, would not allow a dollar to be taken except by authority of law. In this they are entirely independent of the President and Cabinet officers. The cases he parades where certain clerks were allowed extra compensation, were expressly provided for by law, and the law was acted upon by Chase, Fessenden and McCulloch, as well as Boutwell. But he says that in four years these Secretaries paid \$78,397 to Adams Express Company for carrying the forms upon which notes and bonds are printed, when they could have been sent through the mail for one hundredth part of the cost. Well, if they had sent these precious papers, upon the custody of which rests our chief security against counterfeiting, through the mails, they should have been sent to the lunatic asylum. He says we have paid \$1,167,000 since 1862 for printing bonds and notes. Could it have been done for less? Does he say it could? The truth is, no operation of the Government is more delicate and dangerous, and none has been more successful in safety, cheapness and security than the preparation and issue of the vast aggregate of paper securities issued by the Government in the aggregate of over \$10,000,000,000.

WHO ARE THE RASCALS.

He closes this part of his speech by these words, "And in this connection let me ask, why have not the National Banks been required to pay for the paper, engraving, and printing of their own notes, instead of your being taxed for that purpose?"

Alas! poor Yorick. The National Banks have been bitterly complaining that we not only made them pay for their own notes, but that we have made them pay ten times the cost. The truth is that we make them pay, not as a part of their internal taxes, but for the very purpose of paying this expense, one per cent, annually on the amount of their circulation, or three million of dollars per year; so that in this way the National Banks have paid into the Treasury four times the cost of preparing all the bonds and notes issued by the United States since the war commenced; and this goes to swell the general revenue and lessen your taxes. Now, did General Morgan know this fact?

But now comes a terrible sensation. Three hundred and forty internal revenue defaulters. He says, "When I tell you that there have been three hundred and forty defaulters among the collectors of internal revenue, you look surprised, and ask one another 'why have not we been told of this before.' For the simple reason, my friends, because the facts had been concealed, and had not been dug out." Now this is an interesting picture, three hundred and forty defaulters, rascals, thieves, and as many more rascals in the Treasury Department, including Secretary Boutwell, Commissioner Delano, Comptroller Taylor, and such like, covering up, hiding, concealing this rascality, and then comes our friend, Gen. Morgan, the virtuous, the incorruptible miner into rascality, digging up, yes, I dig up this mass of corruption. Yes, I dug it up, I, General Morgan. And to strengthen his assertion he gives names; and among them Frank Soule and Sheridan Shook, familiar names in Johnson's time—champions of the whisky ring—good Democrats.

Now while you look surprised, I can hardly imagine how McCulloch and Rollins, Boutwell and Delano, Stauber, Evarts and Hoar looked, if ever they read this. They are honorable men, bound to prevent rascality, and don't like to be shook in the same bag with Sheridan Shook. And what must be the feeling of the 340 collectors, including nearly every man who formerly held that office. They are branded as deeply as General Morgan can brand

them. What is the basis of this wage-sale charge? It is true that during the past of Johnson's administration the Internal Revenue service became demoralized. I am not here as the defender of the collectors; Hubbell ought to be that. Several of the leading officers openly used their offices to promote the policy of A. B. Johnson. Most of these named by Morgan are shining lights of this faction. Some few, perhaps ten in all, are real defaulters.

THE PARTY THAT MORGAN SHOULD BELONG

The next point made by General Morgan, I lost a respectfully turn over to Mr. Hubbard. It was, I recall No. 75, which it seemed the venerable and worthy Admiral Welles, as secretary of the Navy under President Johnson, issued in May, 1861, and by which General Morgan alleged no unlawfulness at all. I naturally stated the point, and the navy, I think, has since this is true as stated, it was a plain and notable offense of the highest grade, and the fact was, that brother Hubbard, then our Representative, did not have both Johnson and Welles impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors. I told Mr. Morgan that it is a clear case, and I am inclined to think either to defend his chief, whose belief he followed from our ranks, or to explain his neglect of duty. I think I could help him a little by a very simple explanation, but I will not dim his records by so a statement. Certain it is that the Republican party at that session corrected the matter by a plain and a doing the pay of the navy.

and the President, but a Democratic Senate stood in the way. During the war it was essential to concentrate this power as to the army and navy, but Congress found the power to these two departments. Since the war, upon my motion, and mainly in consequence of Mr. Foster's error, the transfer of appropriations was prohibited in all cases—and it was by this statutory prohibition inserted in 1863, that Admiral Porter was caught up with a short turn last year, when, understanding by the transfer of appropriations to improve a new navy. We were asked last winter by the Secretary of the Navy to authorize the transfer, but this was not done by Congress.

N. K. SINGH AND A. N. SINGH

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
84

whisky pay the duty, and all the States and all the sections share in the payment of the taxes to the precise extent they consume the articles taxed. Consumption depends upon the distribution of wealth and population, and increases precisely as wealth and population increase.

Now, fellow citizens, I have gone over this speech without any wish to evade any point made, with nothing but hearty kindness for General Morgan, and I submit to you if this is all that is left of American politics. Has the Republican party so administered the affairs of the Government that these only are the points of arraignment? Has the Democratic party, having been beaten in every great issue, nothing left to say for itself except this gossip of the Capitol, these threadbare remnants of Johnson's administration? If so, would it not be wiser and better to leave the ship of State under the old pilot to meet now in a calm and undisturbed sea such waves as may arise, to confide in Gen. Grant and the men he has about him, to execute the pledges he made in his inaugural, and to keep as your Representative in Congress one who has not disappointed you, or deserted you, or betrayed your trust, but who with honest manliness has met every question as it rose, never dodging, and now gives you, as security for the future, an unblemished character and an honorable record.

LAND GRANTS.

And now, fellow-citizens, let us look for a while at a few questions that naturally give rise to a difference of opinion. Both the Republican and Democratic parties in Ohio have recently proclaimed in State Conventions their opposition to further grants of public lands to railroad companies. As one of your agents, I will feel bound by this decision, and will vote for no further grant of lands to railroads, except that I shall feel bound to give to a Southern Pacific Railroad the same grants of land that have been given to the Northern and Central roads. We ought not in justice to adopt a new policy that will prevent the South from enjoying equal facilities for trans-continental railroads. Since 1862 I have usually voted for railroad grants, but in a question of this kind I will cheerfully obey the general voice of the people of Ohio. But I feel bound to correct some of the errors into which some of our Democratic friends have fallen as to the land grant system. It had its origin with Mr. Douglas in the grant to the Illinois Central Railroad. It was in full force long before the Republican party existed. The most numerous grants ever made were made by the Thirty-fifth Congress, which was Democratic in all its branches. The largest grant ever made was made to the Union Pacific and Northern Pacific Railroads, in 1862 and 1864, and was voted for, I think, by every Democratic member of Congress. It was a policy universally approved and adopted by the West without distinction of party.

It is said that this policy was a waste of public revenue. Not so; the reserved alternate sections were doubled in price and then sold more rapidly than before. The actual money revenue was increased. The advantages of the system were in the rapid development of the West and increased facilities of transportation. Many advantages have grown out of the much abused land grant system, but the reason why I readily acquiesce in the suspension of these grants is that it will enable us to carry out the favorite policy of the Republican party—the homestead law. Let us adopt this principle, that hereafter no public land shall be given away or sold to any one except to a pre-emptor or settler under the homestead law. This will lead to the full execution of the homestead law, and is the only correct basis of a permanent policy. Let the land go to those only who will settle upon, improve and cultivate it, and thus the nation at large will gain a greater benefit than it can get by any gift to railroads or sale to speculators.

THE TARIFF.

Again, a great deal is said among all parties about a protective tariff and a revenue tariff. The last National Democratic Convention, in 1863, declared for "a tariff for revenue upon foreign imports, and such equal taxation under the Internal Revenue laws as

will afford incidental protection to domestic manufactures, and as will, without impairing the revenue, impose the least burden upon and promote and encourage the great industrial interests of the country."

The substance of the recent Republican platform at Columbus is for a revenue tariff with incidental protection. The substance of the recent Democratic State platform is for a revenue tariff, with all the necessities of life free. Now if all the necessities of life are free, the revenue part of a tariff would not be enough for a good Democratic treat. If sugar, tea, coffee, brandy and gin are necessities, I don't see what the luxuries are, unless they are the silks of the ladies, and we have the duty now as high on silk as the ladies will submit to. It is not, fellow citizens, by such general phrases you can deal with a practical question like this. It has been the bone of contention since the beginning of the Government. There are a few simple propositions that we can agree upon, and they settle nearly all the principles upon which a tariff in the present condition of our finances can be based. The primary principle—which governs all the others—is that we must raise revenue enough by a tariff on imported goods to pay the interest of our debt, one per cent. annually of the principal, and the expenses of our foreign intercourse.

This can not be less than 160 millions a year until the Funding bill gradually reduces it. We know that year in and year out our importations of foreign goods are about 460 millions of dollars, exclusive of the flow of gold, which from its use is not taxable. Now a uniform rate of 40 per cent. on all articles would produce the 160 millions which we must raise. Everybody admits that we ought not to levy the same rate of duty on all articles imported, and here is the rub. Political theories, sectional interests and demagogism add to our difficulties in making the distribution. Let us lay these aside, and see if we can agree a little further. Let us divide our importations into classes according to their nature and uses, and fix the rate of duty afterward. A great multitude of articles are too trifling in amount to make it worth while to tax them. Certain medicines of tropical production are indispensable to health. Certain dyes are of universal use, like log-wood, where the chief cost is the trouble of preparing them for use. Certain raw articles are the basis of domestic industry but of little value in themselves—all these we can agree ought to pay no duty. This is class No. 1. We can, perhaps, agree that other articles, which we can not produce in this country, are of such universal use and necessity—such as sugar, tea, coffee, spices—that the duty should be as low as possible consistent with the wants of the Government. But these articles, from their being so universally used, are the most fruitful sources of revenue—yielding us last year \$66,000,000—and if we take the taxes off of these articles we must make up in others. This is class No. 2. Up to this point the only question is one of revenue. We come now to the great mass of articles of prime necessity, which are produced not only in foreign countries but in our own country. Now, any tax you put upon such an imported article is to the extent of the tax a protection to the domestic article. It is not strange, but is in accordance with the universal law of selfishness, that every domestic producer wants the duty as high as possible on the foreign article that competes with him, and as low on everything else. If you put a lower rate of duty than the average of 40 per cent. on the foreign producer you discriminate against the home producer to his injury. If you put a higher duty than 40 per cent. on a foreign article you discriminate in favor of the home producer. This class includes the manufacturers of iron, steel and cotton, all the multiplied objects of modern commerce, also coal, salt, and such natural gifts, whose chief value is in the labor of mining and transportation. This is class No. 3, and, with class No. 2, is the basis of our revenue. There are also a number of articles of luxury, but as their use is confined to a few the revenue is not so great. This I call class No. 4, and includes spirits, wines, cigars, silks, satins and the like. We will agree that these ought to be taxed the rate that will produce the most revenue. Unfortunately, some of them are of a character to be

essily smuggled—such as jewelry, diamonds, and the like, and too high a duty leads to the loss of revenue; while upon others, like brandy and cigars, we levy the highest rates of duty. Now, fellow-citizens, the chief trouble with the present tariff is in the inequality of class No. 3. Some of them are confessedly too high, and some too low. It was upon this rock the general tariff bill broke down in the House. It was a struggle of local interests, and not of party politics. What we wanted to do was to reduce taxes. What we did do finally was to enlarge the free list, or class No. 1, to largely reduce the taxes on class No. 2, to change some *ad valorem* duties in class No. 3 to specific duties of about the same amount, and to somewhat increase the duties on wines. It was not all we might have done, but it was in the right direction.

Now, fellow citizens, apply the Democratic theory to this subject, and how would it leave you? Class No. 1, the free list, they would enlarge, because they are all necessities of life. Class No. 2 they would make full, because they are all necessities of life. There goes sixty millions. Class No. 4 we have already got as high as it will bear. How then can they raise the necessary revenue? Only by increasing the duties on class No. 3, or by reducing taxation and then raising again the ghost of repudiation. I believe before God the last would be the alternative of the Democratic leaders.

Now if I have anything to do with framing the next tariff bill, I would adopt specific duties in every possible case, equal in result to the average *ad valorem* revenue duty demanded by the wants of the Government, and I would apply this rule to all the articles of class No. 3, and make exceptions only when the nature of the article demanded a higher or a lower duty. I would take off the duty from class No. 2, and enlarge the free list only to the extent that I could swell the revenue above the average on class No. 4. Such a tariff framed by practical men would have some chance for stability. It might be lowered or raised by a uniform percentage as our finances justify, or as our importations increased or diminished. It would give to our domestic industry that steady support, protection and encouragement without which we can not compete with the cheaper capital and labor of Europe—and would remove a purely business question from the arena of party politics. You might call such a tariff a revenue tariff, or a protective tariff, or a tariff with incidental protection. "You pay your money and you take your choice." It would produce revenue, and protection is an inevitable incident. The course of the Democratic party on the question is full of absurdities and inconsistencies. They want a revenue tariff, and yet they would repeal the purely

revenue duties on tea, coffee and sugar. They want low duties on iron, cotton and woolen goods, and yet they would enlarge the free list so as to make this impossible. But their absurdities culminated at the close of the last session. They have for years been declaiming against our navigation laws, by which foreign built ships are absolutely prohibited from American registry. When the war broke out between Germany and France, the President recommended and Congress was prepared to admit the great ocean steamers duty free. This rare chance to acquire a navy by the misfortune of other nations, this opportunity to repair the loss of our commercial marine during our war, was defeated for the time by Mr. Brooks of the House, and Mr. Bayard of the Senate, both leading Democrats, by talking until the session closed.

OTHER QUESTIONS

There are many other topics now entering upon American politics which demand the considerate attention of the American people. We have to think of Chinese immigration, of the duty of our country in the great struggle between Germany and France, of our claims against Great Britain, of the labor question in its diversified forms, of the financial questions to which I could only refer, of the Indian question, one of the most interesting of our politics, and many others of like character. Your time will not allow me to discuss them. I can only say in conclusion that each of them has received the considerate attention of the President and of Congress. We have, as far as law can do it, broken up the coolie system. We have maintained our foreign relations with dignity and honor. Unlike Great Britain, we have honestly maintained and enforced the neutrality we proclaim. We have developed the labor and industry of all sections of the country and have maintained peace on our Indian frontier by doing justice to the Indians. Look on this great country of ours, the heart of a continent teeming with busy life, embracing all latitudes, tolerating all religions, educating all children, dealing by an equal and invariable rule with all men, with the favors of heaven resting upon us, with fruitful crops, no famine, no pestilence, no king, no privileged orders, the road to fortune and to fame open equally to all, free institutions, laws of your own making, administered by the great party that guided you through the wilderness, and by the same soldiers who fought your battles and carried your flag with victory. It is for you, fellow-citizens, to say whether it is not better to rest content with all these blessings, than to yield to a reaction full of danger, and merely to again place in office those who, when you trusted them, betrayed you.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 789 491 9

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 789 491 9

permalife®
pH 8.5